



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,826	01/05/2004	Cecile Casterman	04958.0008-08000	4193
23628	7590	02/08/2007	EXAMINER	
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, PC			DIBRINO, MARIANNE NMN	
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE			1644	
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/08/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/751,826	CASTERMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DiBrino Marianne	1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/25/06.  
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 18-36 and 51-59 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23,24,28-30,34,36 and 55-59 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 18-22,25-27,31-33,35 and 51-54 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10/25/06 (Fig. 7A replacement) is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/14/06, 7/24/06</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's amendment and response filed 10/25/06 is acknowledged and has been entered.
2. Applicant is required to amend the specification to list the appropriate SEQ ID NOS for sequences disclosed in the specification (for example, on page 16 at line 16 for CTCGAGT<sub>12</sub>). See 37 C.F.R. 1.821(d)
3. Applicant's replacement drawing for Figure 7A filed 10/25/06 is acceptable.
4. Applicant is reminded of Applicant's election of Group I (claims 18-36 and 51-59), and species of fragment of an immunoglobulin which is the variable region of a heavy chain, said variable region devoid of normal light chain interaction sites, and Applicant's election with traverse of the species of "labeled with a detectable label" that is "a radioactive label" in Applicant's response filed 1/23/06.

Claims 18-21, 25-27, 31-33, 35 and 51-54 read upon the elected species.

Applicant is reminded that upon consideration of the prior art, the search had been extended to include the species recited in instant claim 22, *i.e.*, "immunoglobulin or a fragment thereof according to claim 19, which has a constant region which is devoid of a CH1 domain."

Accordingly, claims 23, 24, 28-30, 34, 36 and 55-59 (non-elected species of Group I) remain withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Claims 18-22, 25-27, 31-33, 35 and 51-54 are currently being examined.

The following are new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's IDS filed 7/24/06 or by Applicant's amendment and response filed 10/25/06.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 18-22, 25-27, 31-33, 35 and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ungar-Waron *et al* (Isr. J. Vet. Med. 1987, Vol. 43(3), pages 198-203, IDS reference) as evidenced by Hamers-Casterman *et al* (Nature 3 June 1993, Vol. 363, pages 446-448, IDS reference), Roux *et al* (PNAS USA 1998, Vol. 95, pages 11804-11809, IDS reference), WO 94/25591 (Applicant's IDS reference in the Form-1449 filed 7/24/06), van der Linden *et al* (Biochimica et Biophysica Acta 1999, 1431: 37-46), and EP 0739981 A1 (of record).

Ungar-Waron *et al* teach a 40 Kd IgG from Camelid serum and composition thereof. Ungar-Waron *et al* teach that when camel serum was precipitated using ammonium sulfate, separated by DEAE-Sephadex, subjected to ultrafiltration, and analyzed by IEP and by SDS-PAGE two bands of 155 Kd and 100 Kd were visualized under non-reducing conditions, the 100Kd band dissociating into the 40 Kd band under reducing conditions upon SDS-PAGE analysis (especially Results and Discussion sections).

Evidentiary reference Hamers-Casterman *et al* teach VHH (V for variable region of heavy chain) from Camelid (infected with trypanosomes) serum that bind a large number of antigens present in a <sup>35</sup>S methionine-labeled trypanosome lysate, said VHH consisting of heavy-chain VHH dimers devoid of light chains and lacking the CH1 domain that binds to the light chain. Hamers-Casterman *et al* teach that the two 100 Kd immunoglobulin fractions yield only heavy chains of 46 Kd and 43 Kd upon reduction (see entire article, and especially second paragraph of article).

Evidentiary reference Roux *et al* teach that in Camelids, two of their three IgG subclasses contain no light chains and the unassociated VH domains interact with antigen as monomers (especially page 11804, column 2, paragraph before Materials and Methods section).

Evidentiary reference WO 94/25591 teaches the presence of considerable amounts of IgG like material of 100 Kd in the serum of the camel and that these molecules are composed of heavy chain dimers and are devoid of light chains. WO 94/25591 further teaches that these molecules bear an extensive antigen binding repertoire, and that camel heavy chain IgGs lack the CH1 domain, which in one IgG class might be structurally replaced by an extended hinge. WO 94/25591 teaches that heavy chain IgGs are a feature of all Camelids. WO 94/25591 teaches that by a combination of

affinity chromatography on Protein A and Protein G, three quantitatively important fractions corresponding to subclasses of IgG can be isolated from the serum of camels, two of which contain molecules of about 100 Kd, which upon reduction yield only heavy chains of 46 Kd (IgG2 fraction binding only to Protein A) and 43 Kd (IgG3 fraction binding to Protein A and Protein G), and both classes lack the light chain completely (see entire reference, especially page 1 at lines 18-32, page 2 at lines 1-4).

WO 94/25591 teaches that this 100 Kd IgG like material is the same as taught by Ungar-Waron et al (the art reference cited in this rejection, see page 1 at lines 18-19 and page 4 at lines 31-32).

Although the art reference Ungar-Waron et al does not teach that the 40 Kd IgG band from *Camelid* serum contains VHH lacking CH1 and devoid of light chains or binds antigens such as those recited in instant claim 53:

- evidentiary reference Hamers-Casterman et al teach the approximately 40 Kd size of the VHH lacking CH1 and devoid of light chains in *Camelid* serum upon reduction of the 100 Kd IgG that bind antigens in a lysate containing proteins, carbohydrates and nucleic acids from an infectious agent and that some *Camelids* have high anti-trypanosome titers,
- Roux et al teach that in *Camelids*, two of their three IgG subclasses contain no light chains and the unassociated VH domains interact with antigen as monomers, and
- WO 94/25591 teaches that the 100 Kd fraction of the art reference Ungar-Waron et al contains *Camelid* IgG heavy chains that lack light chains, lack the CH1 domain, and that these heavy chains bind antigens.

Therefore the claimed antibody appears to be the same as the antibody of the prior art absent a showing of differences. Since the Patent Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing the composition of the instant invention to those of the prior art, the burden is on Applicant to show a distinction between the antibody of the instant invention and that of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

Evidentiary reference van der Linden et al teach that that the IgG *Camelid* heavy chain antibody is devoid of the immunoglobulin light chain. van der Linden et al further teach that the variable fragments of heavy chain antibodies (VHH) do not have the hydrophobic interface which is important in the formation of a functional "classical" antibody molecule, composed of heavy and light chains (page 38 at the first full paragraph at column 1). van der Linden et al teach that unique features of VHH include the absence of both immunoglobulin light chains and the CH1 constant domain, and that camelid VHH have been shown to retain immunoglobulin functions such as specific antigen binding (paragraph spanning pages 43-44).

With regard to the recitation of "said variable region being devoid of normal light chain interaction sites" in instant claims 18, 19, 51 and 52, although the art reference Ungar-Waron *et al* does not teach that the *Camelid* IgG comprises a variable region devoid of normal light chain interaction sites, the evidentiary reference van der Linden *et al* teach that the *Camelid* variable fragments of the heavy chain antibodies do not have the hydrophobic interface which is important in the formation of a functional classical antibody molecule that is composed of heavy and light chains. Therefore the claimed antibody appears to be the same as the antibody of the prior art absent a showing of differences. Since the Patent Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing the composition of the instant invention to those of the prior art, the burden is on Applicant to show a distinction between the antibody of the instant invention and that of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

Evidentiary reference EP 0739981 A1 teaches that the superior solubility of *Camelid* VH domain along with its small size and amino acid sequence of the framework region that is very homologous to that of human, ensure a minimum of immunogenicity when administered to humans (especially page 11 at lines 14-23), *i.e.*, that it is "suitable for use in *in vivo* diagnosis" recited in instant claim 32.

However, claims 31 and 32 are also included in this rejection because the intended uses of the immunoglobulin "suitable for use in *in vitro* diagnosis" or "suitable for use in *in vivo* diagnosis", respectively, do not carry patentable weight per se.

Claims 51 and 52 are included in this rejection because the art reference teaches partially purified and substantially purified fractions containing of IgG from *Camelid* sera, *i.e.*, a "composition comprising an Immunoglobulin or fragment thereof..."

Claims 33 and 35 are included in this rejection because the art reference teaches the antibody labeled with a protein stain, *i.e.*, a detectable label that is a chemical label.

Claims 25-27 are included in this rejection because the recitation of a method wherein the claimed product is made carries no patentable weight in these product claims.

The instant claims that recite "fragment thereof" are included in this rejection because the 40 Kd band taught by the art reference is a fragment of a divalent immunoglobulin that binds antigen as evidenced by WO 94/25591.

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

Applicant's said arguments are of record on pages 9-11 of Applicant's amendment filed 10/25/06.

It is the Examiner's position that the claimed antibody appears to be the same as the antibody of the prior art absent a showing of differences for the reasons of record enunciated in the instant rejection. In response to Applicant's arguments, the evidentiary reference WO 94/25591 teaches that the 40 kDa band taught by Ungar-Waron *et al* contains *Camelid* heavy chain IgG antibodies devoid of light chains and said antibodies bind antigen, regardless of whether or not contaminant proteins are also present. In addition, the percent ammonium sulfate precipitation used by Ungar-Waron *et al* concentrates immunoglobulins while excluding many other serum proteins, therefore it is a partial purification protocol. In response to Applicant's argument to Azwai *et al* (IDS reference Applicant's Form-1449 filed 7/24/06), it is not material to this rejection that Azwai *et al* did not definitively identify the 42 kDa band as IgG.

7. Claims 18-22, 25-27, 31-33, 35 and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grover *et al* (Ind. J. Biochem. Biophys. 1983, 20(4): 238-240, IDS reference filed 7/24/06) as evidenced by WO 94/25591 (IDS reference filed 7/24/06), Satija *et al* (Inf. Immun. 1979, 24(2): 567-570), van der Linden *et al* (Biochimica et Biophysica Acta 1999, 1431: 37-46), and EP 0739981 A1 (of record).

Grover *et al* teach camel IgG2 isotype polyclonal antibodies, including in reduced form. Grover *et al* teach that polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis of ammonium sulfate precipitated camel serum immunoglobulins was done as described by Satija *et al* in Inf. Immun. 1979, 24(2): 567-570, (especially pages 238-239 of Grover *et al*).

Evidentiary reference WO 94/25591 teaches the presence of considerable amounts of IgG like material of 100 Kd in the serum of the camel and that these molecules are composed of heavy chain dimers and are devoid of light chains. WO 94/25591 further teaches that these molecules bear an extensive antigen binding repertoire, and that camel heavy chain IgGs lack the CH1, which in one IgG class might be structurally replaced by an extended hinge. WO 94/25591 teaches that heavy chain IgGs are a feature of all *Camelids*. WO 94/25591 teaches that by a combination of affinity chromatography on Protein A and Protein G, three quantitatively important fractions corresponding to subclasses of IgG can be isolated from the serum of camels, two of which contain molecules of about 100 Kd, which upon reduction yield only heavy chains of 46 Kd (IgG2 fraction binding only to Protein A) and 43 Kd (IgG3 fraction binding to Protein A and Protein G), and both classes lack the light chain completely (see entire reference, especially page 1 at lines 18-32, page 2 at lines 1-4).

Art Unit: 1644

Evidentiary reference Satija *et al* teach that polyacrylamide electrophoresis involved staining the gel with a solution of amido black in HAc (i.e., labeled with a detectable label that is a chemical marker as recited in instant claims 33 and 35, respectively, materials and methods section).

Although the art reference Grover *et al* does not teach that the IgG2 istotype antibody from *Camelid* serum contains VHH lacking CH1 and devoid of light chains, or binds antigens such as those recited in instant claim 53, evidentiary reference WO 94/25591 teaches that the *Camelid* IgG2 heavy chains lack light chains and that these heavy chains bind antigens. Therefore the claimed antibody appears to be the same as the antibody of the prior art absent a showing of differences. Since the Patent Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing the composition of the instant invention to those of the prior art, the burden is on Applicant to show a distinction between the antibody of the instant invention and that of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

Evidentiary reference van der Linden *et al* teach that that the IgG *Camelid* heavy chain antibody is devoid of the immunoglobulin light chain. van der Linden *et al* further teach that the variable fragments of heavy chain antibodies (VHH) do not have the hydrophobic interface which is important in the formation of a functional "classical" antibody molecule, composed of heavy and light chains (page 38 at the first full paragraph at column 1). van der Linden *et al* teach that unique features of VHH include the absence of both immunoglobulin light chains and the CH1 constant domain, and that camelid VHH have been shown to retain immunoglobulin functions such as specific antigen binding (paragraph spanning pages 43-44).

With regard to the recitation of "said variable region being devoid of normal light chain interaction sites" in instant claims 18, 19, 51 and 52, although the art reference Grover *et al* does not teach that the IgG2 istotype antibody from *Camelid* serum comprises a variable region that is devoid of normal light chain interaction sites, the evidentiary reference van der Linden *et al* teach that that the IgG *Camelid* heavy chain antibody is devoid of the immunoglobulin light chain and that the variable fragments of these heavy chain antibodies (VHH) do not have the hydrophobic interface which is important in the formation of a functional "classical" antibody molecule, composed of heavy and light chains. Therefore the claimed antibody appears to be the same as the antibody of the prior art absent a showing of differences. Since the Patent Office does not have the facilities for examining and comparing the composition of the instant invention to those of the prior art, the burden is on Applicant to show a distinction between the antibody of the instant invention and that of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977).

Evidentiary reference EP 0739981 A1 teaches that the superior solubility of Camelid VH domain along with its small size and amino acid sequence of the framework region that is very homologous to that of human, ensure a minimum of immunogenicity when administered to humans (especially page 11 at lines 14-23), *i.e.*, that it is "suitable for use in *in vivo* diagnosis."

However, claims 31 and 32 are also included in this rejection because the intended uses of the immunoglobulin "suitable for use in *in vitro* diagnosis" or "suitable for use in *in vivo* diagnosis", respectively, do not carry patentable weight *per se*.

Claims 51 and 52 are included in this rejection because the art reference teaches a partially purified fraction containing of IgG from 'Camelid sera, *i.e.*, a "composition comprising an Immunoglobulin or fragment thereof..."

Claims 25-27 are included in this rejection because the recitation of a method wherein the claimed product is made carries no patentable weight in these product claims.

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1644

9. Claims 18-22, 25-27, 31, 32 and 51-54 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-27 of copending Application No. 11/350,900. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the VHH IgG2 isotype recited in the claims of copending '900 are encompassed by the VHH of the instant claims (which encompass IgGg2 and IgGg3 isotypes) as evidenced by van der Linden *et al* (Biochimica et Biophysica Acta 1999, 1431: 37-46). This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Instant claims 18, 19, 51 and 52 recite "said variable region being devoid of normal light chain interaction sites, whereas the claims 18, 23, 24, 26 and 27 of '900 recite "heavy chain immunoglobulin(s)...naturally devoid of light chains."

Evidentiary reference van der Linden *et al* teach that that the IgG *Camelid* heavy chain antibody is [naturally] devoid of the immunoglobulin light chain. van der Linden *et al* further teach that the variable fragments of heavy chain antibodies (VHH) do not have the hydrophobic interface which is important in the formation of a functional "classical" antibody molecule, composed of heavy and light chains, *i.e.*, lack interaction sites for light chain binding (page 38 at the first full paragraph at column 1).

The humanized immunoglobulin recited in claims 24 and 25 of copending '900 are obvious variants of the immunoglobulins of the instant claims. Claim 54 is included in this rejection because an immunoglobulin that specifically binds a protein on tumor cells is an obvious variant of an immunoglobulin. Claim 53 is included in this rejection because an immunoglobulin that specifically binds a protein, hapten, carbohydrate or nucleic acid antigen is an obvious variant of an immunoglobulin.

The Examiner notes that Applicant has brought copending Application No. 11/350,900 to the Examiner's attention in Applicant's STATEMENT FILED PURSUANT TO THE DUTY OF DISCLOSURE UNDER 37 CFR §§1.56, 1.97 AND 1.98 accompanying the IDS Form-1449 filed 7/24/06 on page 2, Part II, although Applicant did not list the said Application No. on the said Form-1449. The Examiner further notes that copending Application No. 11/350,900 was filed by Applicant on 2/10/06 (after the last Office Action was mailed).

Art Unit: 1644

10. Claims 33 and 35 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-27 of copending Application No. 11/350,900 in view of Harlow and Lane. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 33 and 35 are drawn to a VH<sub>H</sub> immunoglobulin or fragment thereof labeled with a detectable label (claim 33) that is a radioisotope, an enzymatic marker, or chemiluminescent marker (claim 35).

Claims 18-27 of '900 are drawn to a VH<sub>H</sub> immunoglobulin that is not labeled with a detectable label.

Harlow and Lane teach labeling antibodies with radioisotopes, enzymatic markers or fluorochromes (*i.e.*, chemiluminescent markers) for the purpose of immunoassay (page 591).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have labeled the immunoglobulins recited in claims 18-27 of '900 with the detectable labels taught by Harlow and Lane.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this to prepare immunoglobulins recited in the claims of '900 that are suitable for immunoassay as taught by Harlow and Lane.

11. Claims 18-22, 25-27, 31, 32 and 51-54 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,005,079 as evidenced by WO 94/25591, by an admission in the instant specification on page 13 at paragraphs 2-5, and as evidenced by van der Linden *et al* (*Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 1999, 1431: 37-46). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of '079 are encompassed by the instant claims.

The claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,005,079 are drawn to an immunoglobulin (or fragment thereof) comprising two heavy polypeptide chains, each heavy chain containing a binding site specific for an antigen, said immunoglobulin containing a variable (VH<sub>H</sub>) region and a constant region, said constant region being devoid of the CH1 domain and wherein the immunoglobulin is devoid of light chains, including wherein the immunoglobulin is obtainable by adsorption by affinity chromatography on Protein A, but not protein G (*i.e.*, is IgG2), or is absorbed by both Protein A and by Protein G (*i.e.*, is IgG3), and including wherein the molecular weight is about 100Kd non-reduced and about 45 kD reduced, and wherein position 45 is not leucine, but rather is cysteine or a charged amino acid residue.

Art Unit: 1644

Evidentiary reference WO 94/25591 teaches the presence of considerable amounts of IgG like material of 100 Kd in the serum of the camel and that these molecules are composed of heavy chain dimers and are devoid of light chains. WO 94/25591 further teaches that these molecules bear an extensive antigen binding repertoire, and that camel heavy chain IgGs lack the CH1, which in one IgG class might be structurally replaced by an extended hinge. WO 94/25591 teaches that heavy chain IgGs are a feature of all *Camelids*. WO 94/25591 teaches that by a combination of affinity chromatography on Protein A and Protein G, three quantitatively important fractions corresponding to subclasses of IgG can be isolated from the serum of camels, two of which contain molecules of about 100 Kd, which upon reduction yield only heavy chains of 46 Kd (IgG2 fraction binding only to Protein A) and 43 Kd (IgG3 fraction binding to Protein A and Protein G), and both classes lack the light chain completely (see entire reference, especially page 1 at lines 18-32, page 2 at lines 1-4).

The admission in the instant specification on page 13 at paragraphs 2-5 is that a difference between normal 4 chain immunoglobulins and camelid VHH immunoglobulins is the presence of leucine (98%), proline (1%) or glutamine (1%) at position 45 *versus* arginine, glutamic acid (*i.e.*, charged amino acid residues) or cysteine at position 45.

Evidentiary reference van der Linden *et al* teach that that the IgG *Camelid* heavy chain antibody is [naturally] devoid of the immunoglobulin light chain. van der Linden *et al* further teach that the variable fragments of heavy chain antibodies (VHH) do not have the hydrophobic interface which is important in the formation of a functional "classical" antibody molecule, composed of heavy and light chains, *i.e.*, lack interaction sites for light chain binding (page 38 at the first full paragraph at column 1).

Claim 54 is included in this rejection because an immunoglobulin that specifically binds a protein on tumor cells is an obvious variant of an immunoglobulin. Claim 53 is included in this rejection because an immunoglobulin that specifically binds a protein, hapten, carbohydrate or nucleic acid antigen is an obvious variant of an immunoglobulin.

12. Claims 33 and 35 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,005,079 in view of Harlow and Lane.

Claims 33 and 35 are drawn to a VHH immunoglobulin or fragment thereof labeled with a detectable label (claim 33) that is a radioisotope, an enzymatic marker, or chemiluminescent marker (claim 35).

Claims 1-14 of '079 are drawn to a VHH immunoglobulin or fragment thereof that is not labeled with a detectable label.

Harlow and Lane teach labeling antibodies with radioisotopes, enzymatic markers or flurochromes (*i.e.*, chemiluminescent markers) for the purpose of immunoassay (page 591).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have labeled the immunoglobulins recited in claims 18-27 of '079 with the detectable labels taught by Harlow and Lane.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this to prepare immunoglobulins recited in the claims of '079 that are suitable for immunoassay as taught by Harlow and Lane.

13. Claims 18-22, 25-27, 31-33, 35 and 51-54 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 5,840,526 as evidenced by an admission in the instant specification on page 13 at paragraphs 2-5 and by van der Linden *et al* (*Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 1999, 1431: 37-46) and WO 94/25591. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of '526 are encompassed by the instant claims.

The claims 1-10 are drawn to an immunoglobulin comprising two heavy polypeptide chains, each heavy chain consisting of a complete antigen binding site, said immunoglobulin containing a VHH region and a constant region, said constant region being devoid of polypeptide light chains, and wherein the variable region contains at position 45 an amino acid which is not a leucine, proline or glutamine residue, and including wherein the amino acid sequence is partially defined.

The admission in the instant specification on page 13 at paragraphs 2-5 is that a difference between normal 4 chain immunoglobulins and camelid VHH immunoglobulins is the presence of leucine (98%), proline (1%) or glutamine (1%) at position 45 *versus* arginine, glutamic acid (*i.e.*, charged amino acid residues) or cysteine at position 45.

Evidentiary reference van der Linden *et al* teach that that the IgG *Camelid* heavy chain antibody is [naturally] devoid of the immunoglobulin light chain. van der Linden *et al* further teach that the variable fragments of heavy chain antibodies (VHH) do not have the hydrophobic interface which is important in the formation of a functional "classical" antibody molecule, composed of heavy and light chains, *i.e.*, lack interaction sites for light chain binding (page 38 at the first full paragraph at column 1).

Evidentiary reference WO 94/25591 teaches the presence of considerable amounts of IgG like material of 100 Kd in the serum of the camel and that these molecules are composed of heavy chain dimers and are devoid of light chains. WO 94/25591 further teaches that these molecules bear an extensive antigen binding repertoire, and that camel heavy chain IgGs lack the CH1, which in one IgG class might be structurally replaced by an extended hinge. WO 94/25591 teaches that heavy chain IgGs are a feature of all *Camelids*. WO 94/25591 teaches that by a combination of affinity chromatography on Protein A and Protein G, three quantitatively important fractions corresponding to subclasses of IgG can be isolated from the serum of camels, two of which contain molecules of about 100 Kd, which upon reduction yield only heavy chains of 46 Kd (IgG2 fraction binding only to Protein A) and 43 Kd (IgG3 fraction binding to Protein A and Protein G), and both classes lack the light chain completely (see entire reference, especially page 1 at lines 18-32, page 2 at lines 1-4).

Claim 54 is included in this rejection because an immunoglobulin that specifically binds a protein on tumor cells is an obvious variant of an immunoglobulin.

14. Claims 18-22, 25-27, 31-33, 35 and 51-54 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,765,087 as evidenced by van der Linden *et al* (Biochimica et Biophysica Acta 1999, 1431: 37-46). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of '087 are encompassed by the instant claims.

Evidentiary reference van der Linden *et al* teach that that the IgG *Camelid* heavy chain antibody is [naturally] devoid of the immunoglobulin light chain. van der Linden *et al* further teach that the variable fragments of heavy chain antibodies (VHH) do not have the hydrophobic interface which is important in the formation of a functional "classical" antibody molecule, composed of heavy and light chains, *i.e.*, lack interaction sites for light chain binding (page 38 at the first full paragraph at column 1).

Claim 54 is included in this rejection because an immunoglobulin that specifically binds a protein on tumor cells is an obvious variant of an immunoglobulin.

15. No claim is allowed.

16. The following applies to Applicant's Form-1449 filed 7/24/06:

- a. The Webster's II reference has not been considered because it is of poor quality and can not be read.
- b. The Mounir *et al* reference has not been considered because it has not been provided by Applicant.

17. Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 7/24/06 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609.04(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Marianne DiBrino whose telephone number is 571-272-0842. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Christina Y. Chan, can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Marianne DiBrino*

Marianne DiBrino, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner  
Group 1640  
Technology Center 1600  
January 23, 2007

*John Leguyader*  
JOHN LEGUYADER  
DIRECTOR  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

*Christina Chan*  
CHRISTINA CHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600